THE
"HINDU MESSAGE"
A Weekly Review of Indian and World-Problems from the Hindu Standpoint.

Editors: K. Sundararama Aiyar M.A., & T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A.

VOL. 2.] THURSDAY MAY 23, 1918. [No. 5.

The **Hindu Message** stands for

(1) The Maintenance of British supremacy with self-government for India,

(2) Co-operation with the different communities of India without prejudice to Hindu Dharma,

(3) Education of the Hindus as an integral part of the Indian Nation,

(4) Advancement of Material prosperity on a spiritual basis and

(5) Dissemination of pure Hindu Culture.

Annual Subscription Rs. 6 only.
For *bona fide* students Rs 3 only.
Single copy As. 2 only.

All business communications and remittances to be addressed to the Manager and all literary contributions and books for Review to be addressed to the Editor, THE HINDU MESSAGE, *Srirangam.*

A Vision Of India.
THE YAMUNA—VII.
By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

He played upon the glad lip-kissing flute
And won the world to God by melodies,
And o'er all hearts there came an unknown peace
Which into man the God changed man the brute.
The favoured maidens fair and fleet of foot
Around him danced, awhile the southern breeze
With fragrant coolness moved through Gokul's trees
Which shone with wealth of heavenly flower and fruit.
A full moon rapt in joy in star-lit skies
Shone still and fair. As many Krishnas came
To being then as there were maidens there
Thy emerald banks then shone like paradise,
For wheree'er shines His Love's immortal flame
Is heaven full-dowered with radiant raptures rare.

The Hindu Message

THURSDAY EVENING 23, MAY, 1918.

The Conjeeveram Conference.

[Rao Sahib CUNNAN CHETTIAR'S WELCOME ADDRESS.]

We heartily congratulate Rao Sahib C. Cunnan Chettiar on his admirable speech as the President of the Reception Committee. From start to finish it breathes the spirit of a loyal and lofty patriotism of which any Indian may justifiably feel proud,—a patriotism whose depth and breadth is worthy of the philanthropy of the universally-esteemed merchant-prince of Madras. We are proud of him not only on account of his cosmopolitan and discriminating benevolence, but also on account of his worthy and sincere patriotism,—a patriotism, too, which has found fitting expression in an address full of noble sentiments nobly thought out and worthily expressed—an address in every way worthy of the occasion which called it forth and of the "hallowed city" of whose historical traditions and sacred associations he spoke with genuine faith and commendable fervour.

At the outset of his address, Rao Sahib Chettiar, with a modesty which, however attractive, was, as the event proved, altogether superfluous, claimed the indulgence of his audience on the ground that he was "neither" competent nor desirous to make any pronouncements on the important problems now before the country." He said:—"I am neither, as our enemies maliciously call our great political leaders, a professional politician nor a brahmin vakil; neither a professional agitator nor a Brahmin Home Ruler." And further:—"I have been connected with business occupation for over fifteen years. During this period I have had neither the desire at any time to take the lead in public affairs, nor have I had the good fortune to bear as vigorous a part in the work of national political amelioration as you have all, with so much zeal and public spirit, borne." And yet the Rao Sahib Chettiar's pronouncement on the political situation is one which is in every way admirable and unobjectionable, and which well illustrates the adage that the by-stander often sees things more clearly and truly than those who are engaged in the midst of the strife of the arena. Every impartial and discerning man will unfailingly see that the Rao Sahib Chettiar's pronouncements on the situation are, one and all of them, those of a competent observer who combines a clear head and ripe judgment with discriminating patriotism and a sense of duty to his fellow-citizens.

The Rao Sahib Chettiar appropriately began by expressing his views regarding the Delhi Conference. On his own behalf and on that of his audience, he "cordially endorses" His Excellency the Viceroy's "prompt response assuring the Premier of the whole-hearted support of this country in fighting the War for liberty to a successful issue." At the same time he places himself in line with all enlightened public men in India by saying in well-chosen words:—"I cannot help giving expression to my disappointment that His Excellency the Viceroy did not see fit to take advantage of the great occasion to appeal to and capture the imagination of the Indian people

by announcing to them the speedy establishment of those liberties and rights in their own country to secure which for other parts of the Empire and other allied nations far away from them they have now been called upon to fight." His Excellency the Viceroy said at the Delhi Conference:—"The liberties of the world must be won before our aspirations for the liberalising of Indian political institutions can acquire any tangible meaning." To this Rao Sahib Chettiar gives a telling reply when he asks, "Is not the liberty of India included in the liberty of the whole world?", and proceeds to point out that "to ask India to wait for her freedom until after all other parts of the world have secured their liberty" is "far from being the best way of appealing to the Indian Nation of the present day." We cannot help also quoting the following sentence with its noble sentiment expressed in language befitting its fervid patriotism:—"To ask the manhood of a great, loyal and historic people comprising a fifth of the human race to rally to the ranks and fight the battles of freedom for all other parts of the Empire and all other parts of the world, to tell them that they must continue a subject people governed by an outside ruling race whose progress towards freedom must await the results of this War, is by no means complimentary to our National Consciousness or creditable to our British rulers who have evoked and evolved it in us—not the least by the prosecution of the war itself." Rao Sahib Chettiar also strikes out an original vein of criticism concerning the War when he points out that "German Militarism cannot be resisted by a reliance upon mercenary armies or even a most efficient navy," and that "the certainty of victory depends upon an effective appeal to the consciences of all liberty loving mankind to fight in the name, and for the sake of, freedom—National and International—all over the world." This, in our view, proves the case for India's freedom to the hilt, and Rao Sahib Chettiar's sound and healthy common sense is entitled to the full credit of the idea.

Rao Sahib Chettiar proceeds to point out that the proposals embodied in the Congress-League scheme form "the immediate minimum of our requirements," that they "were overdue before the War for liberty was started," that "India did not take advantage of the War to ask for more," that "our work and achievements in the War have admittedly earned the approbation and admiration of the Empire and the world," and that, therefore, it was not "the spirit of the hucksterer or the bargainer" that impelled Indian leaders "to issue the manifesto in which they asked for measures which will make the response of India to the call of the Empire at this critical juncture full, real, and effective."

Rao Sahib Chettiar proceeds to refute "the dishonest insinuation" that the demand made in the Hon. Mr. Khaparde's motion at the Delhi Conference was because "we desire to take advantage of the Empire's difficulties." He gives the real explanation, and no one can question its absolute correctness:—"The old order has changed in India too. It has changed under our very eyes. It may have changed very quietly and equably, but nevertheless swiftly, though perhaps with less of the noise and the heat and tumult of reconstruction of which so much is heard in all the belligerent countries.

The desire for change in India has spread far and wide, and the resolve to have reform and reconstruction is deliberate and strong. I cannot recall any other time of peaceful progress when the minds of the masses were so filled with the desire to change in the direction of freedom, self-determination and self-rule under the British Empire." "We want to see the disappearance from this country of the exploitation by foreigners or fellow-citizens who are not and cannot be a Government constituted of the representatives of the people, but who constitute a Government representative of special interests controlled by a machine of bureaucratic tradition." The following fine sentiments finely expressed must appeal to all truly Indian hearts, irrespective of caste or creed:—"No true Indian subject of His Majesty will deny that the establishment and maintenance of British rule in India has been a providential dispensation which consciously and unconsciously ensures for the well-being and prosperity of both nations and of the Empire also. That is a Providence to which I am willing we should all submit to. But if a limited class of men, believing themselves as superior persons belonging to a dominant race, pretend to set up themselves as Providence over ourselves, I stoutly protest. Conjeeveram was the abode for a long time of one of the greatest of our religious saviours. But, to adopt the language of a great lover of freedom, I have never met a political saviour in the flesh, and I never expect to meet one, even in this hallowed city of Conjeeveram." Rao Sahib Chettiar claims that "the people of India understand their interests better than any group of men settled in the confines of India or coming down from outside can understand them." It is for the acceptance of this principle that "our leaders in the Congress and the Moslem league have fought for over a generation." But, "whatever the value of its theoretical acceptance, they have never got any nearer to the practical and substantial fulfilment of the eternal principle of self-determination."

Rao Sahib Chettiar then goes on condemning the Non-Brahmin agitation. He says convincingly that "it is to the discredit of the politicians of the so-called Non-Brahmin anti-Home Rule school that this level-headed province should have been subjected to a fissiparous process." And further:—"The reckless lead which it has had from disappointed politicians and the unscrupulous methods pursued by some of its votaries to obtain support and official favour for it by a betrayal of the cause of liberty and by the fulsome support of a policy of a more or less perpetual tutelage of the people to a paternal system of government, are indeed well-known." He further referred to its "sinister purpose" and spoke of "the unreasoning hatred which some of its supporters have sought to create against one of the most honoured and public-spirited classes in South India." Finally, he added a warning to "these thoughtless people among us," and it flows from a conviction which, he avowed, was "born of my actual experience not of politicians and agitators but of plain business men and the masses of toilers and workers, men of the town and country with whom I have come in contact in the course of my business." That warning is,—"I do not believe for a moment that any appreci-

able section of our people want to be under servitude." "Our people, all classes of them, want to stand on the firm foundation of law and right, and to take care of themselves."

Rao Sahib Chettiar then went on to deal with the bureaucratic claim that "they sympathise with the people, that their hearts go out to the masses of unknown men in this country." In reply, he flings to their face a series of unquestionable facts such as that "their thoughts are in close and habitual association with their own vested interests, with their racial advantages and special benefits which have gone along with their benevolent rule over the country for a century and a half,"—that they have "maintained the rigours of an Arms Act even to the verge of the emasculation of the people of the country as we have known to our cost during this war,"—that "they have regulated the commercial and fiscal policy of India up till last year strictly according to the requirements of British Capital and trade,"—that "they who profess so much sympathy with the masses of the people in the country have left the people without free education, have left the ryot whose contributions to the state are periodically enhanced as resourceless and unable to tide over the slightest touch of famine or the smallest failure of his crops as he was—as the disastrous conditions in Kaira have shown." Also, "their individual experts and departments have done but little to establish that diversification of industries and occupations which will relieve the more or less entire dependence of India upon land and agriculture." He clinched this part of his argument by asking,—"How can such people, I venture to submit, claim that it is they, and not the representatives of the people, that should have a voice in determining what is good for the people's welfare and progress."

We have already exceeded our usual limits, and so we pass over the remainder of the address. The address is one memorable both for its matter and manner, and reflects high credit on its author's qualities of head and heart. Rao Sahib Chettiar will surely henceforth take his place among our chief political leaders

---

Government and the Press.

The question, what is the legitimate extent of the influence exercised by the Press on the Executive, has recently come to the fore in England. There have been two conspicuous instances—those of General Robertson and Admiral Jellicoe—of officials being attacked by certain papers, and immediately or shortly after the present ministry dispensed with their services in the offices they were then holding. The Ministry also appointed to certain Ministerial offices journalists or proprietors of journals in which the attacks appeared. It is these events—or the suspicion or belief widely prevalent that such events had happened—that have brought into prominence the question of the relations that ought to subsist between the Government and the Press. There has not only been much comment in the papers, but also a lively discussion on the subject in the House of Commons itself—a discussion in which the present and the late Prime Ministers took part, and one other person—Mr. Austen Chamberlain—at least who has held office of Cabinet rank.

The well-known journalist, author

and critic, "A. G. G." has discussed the question in a leading London daily, "The Daily News." with such seriousness and fervour of passion that one almost begins to suspect that there must have been cause for something of the nature of an approach to a new peril to the British Constitution. He wrote:—"The House of Commons has no more influence on the policy of this country to-day than a village debating society." "The re-assertion of the right of Parliament to govern is the most urgent necessity of the moment." This hysterical method of dealing with the matter, though in consonance with the excitement occasioned at the time, had not the least justification. For as the Premier explained journalists and newspaper proprietors in other Allied countries such as America, Fance and Italy, held high offices in their respective Governments. Moreover, the Germans had, with deadly effect organised "the important department of offensive and defensive warfare connected with propaganda,"—*i e.*, with the dissemination of information regarding war in such a manner as to influence popular opinion in Russia and Italy. In England, this department had already been brought into existence by Mr. Asquith's Government, but was far from being adequate to its work. It had, therefore, to be re-organised, and Lord Northcliffe's aid was sought and obtained for that purpose. The Premier said:—"No man better qualified for that difficult task could, in my opinion, be found in the Empire, and the Government are grateful to him for undertaking it," and he also undertook the work without holding or seeking a Ministerial office. As regards Lords Rothermere and Beaverbrook, they had control of newspapers when they were invited to take office in the Government, but they gave up the business of controlling their newspapers upon taking office as Ministers. They were also both men of exceptional ability and had done the work entrusted to them with unqualified success,—Lord Rothermere as the head of the War Office administration, and Lord Beaverbrook as the organiser of the Canadian propaganda. Such propaganda had been almost exclusively entrusted in all Allied Countries and in Germany to experienced newspaper men as the best qualified for it.

As regards the newspaper attacks on admirals and generals, followed by their dismissal, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, speaking in the House of Commons, admitted that it was "an unfortunate co-incidence." The Prime Minister himself, or an official of his staff had been suspected of having inspired the newspaper paragraphs containing the attacks, and the hysterical conclusions drawn by writers like "A. G. G." about the accomplishment, under the present Ministerial regime, of great and sudden constitutional changes like the abolition of Government by Parliament and the substitution of Government by the Press were all based on the assumption that Mr. Lloyd-George was indeed guilty of what he had been suspected,—viz., of using certain newspapers to create a popular prejudice against those whom he wanted to remove from certain offices and responsibilities. But he declared from his place in Parliament and in the most positive and direct manner that "the charge is untrue." He also said, in regard to the suspicions against a certain member of his staff that "the imputation is absolutely unfounded and constitutes a gross

injustice to an able civil servant." It must not, however, be forgotten that Ministerial denials of this kind are often made, but the charges originally made turn out in the event not altogether unfounded. The public however, must give full credence to Ministers' utterances so long as they are not disproved, or at least modified in the light of actual facts subsequently brought out and established to the satisfaction of the public. Otherwise, no statesman can be found willing, as head of the Government, to undertake the responsibility of administering public affairs.

After all has been said, however, in extenuation or explanation of the policy and measures of the Government, there can be no doubt that a great deal of danger, if not also of impropriety, exists in entrusting any part of the public administration to those who conduct newspapers control their policy, or inspire, or even influence, the editorial comments, on particular events. For, it would be impossible that in course of public business, thay should not come into possession of information of a highly confidential character, and it would be manifestly absurd to expect them so as to improve the status and influence of their newspapers in the public eye. Such publication must necessarily influence the course of events for good or evil and embarrass those who are entrusted with the discharge of public duties. In the next place, when such newspapers become liable to public prosecution in regard to any matter of public importance, the Minister responsible for the sanctioning or conduct of such prosecution, or even the Ministry as a body, would find themselves in the difficult and delicate position of having to deal with a colleague of their own and responsible, like themselves, for the conduct of public affairs and the situation which had arisen in consequence of the publication of confidential transactions.

Mr. Asquith, who took part in the debate, was perfectly right when he said that "any association of that kind (between the Government and the Press) is to be deprecated and ought not to be permitted in any shape or form." He especially condemned the use, by Government officials of the newspapers with which they were connected, either as proprietors, directors or otherwise, to conduct what he called "a campaign against those who are serving the state as soldiers and sailors in positions of public responsibility of a most arduous kind." Mr. Asquith made a distinction between attacks against politicians in Parliament and attacks against those employed in important and responsible offices in the service of the state. The former can at least defend themselves from their place in Parliament. But the latter cannot, and have simply to "rely with the most absolute confidence upon the loyal support of those who are their official superiors. There had been on various occasions organised campaigns or conspiracies, conducted with great assiduity and with special means of information, in order to compass the dismissal or ruin of various state officials. He held therefore, that no member of the Government should have any association with the Press, or at least such association as would enable him to carry on such a campaign or conspiracy by securing the information needed.

The question here arises,—what is the true function of the Press? Its

true function is to communicate information, and also to enlighten public opinion on the course of events. "A. G. G." says that "Government by the Press, is the form of Government under which we(*i e*., Englishmen) live to day." This is simply a caricature of the course of the events we have referred to. The Press must necessarily influence the policy of the Government, and it does so by influencing public opinion. A popular government has to conciliate puplic opinion, and therefore allows its policy to be influenced by it. Government, also, influences public opinion and the press is one of the channels by which it seduces the public to approve of its measures. But by taking such a course, Government ought not to be considered as "entering into partnership with the Press," or becoming "its instrument." The Government of England is always and in the last resort, Government by and through Parliament

Educating the Poor.

The poor School's Society, Madras, must be congratulated on its interesting and useful report for the year 1917. One of the greatest problems awaiting our attention among the schemes of the future in India is the larger extension of free and primary education. Apart from Government aid which one must naturally expect in successfully working out this problem in all its larger issues, private effort in this direction is certainly a wholesome preliminary, and must receive due support from all classes in the country. The Corporation of Madras has already done good service to the public by opening a large number of free schools in the city; and the Poor School's Society is another body devoted to this useful side of public work. The rudiments of general and technical instruction, sanitation, hygiene and co-operation have got to filter down to the lowest strata of the population, and, above all, a "fine moral instinct" has got to be created in them. The poor must thus be made to realise that they are as useful members of the Indian social system, as any others and that their lives are also capable of being lit up by the bright sunshine of joy and hope.

The education that is sought to be given in the night schools maintained by the poor School's Society is rightly many-sided. Among the problems which the report of the Society brings before our minds, three stand out prominently. One is the problem of co-operation. Among the labouring classes, ignorance is the mother of many troubles like bad debts and disproportionate and even harmful living. Co-operation on its secure basis of self-reliance and mutual trust is the only remedy for this state of affairs. The Report itself states that the system of loans on credit on easy terms can be developed, and this fact deserves prominent notice. We are glad that a Brahman Vakil of standing in Madras has come forward to advance decent loans to relieve cases of need. We read that co-operation has worked wonders in production, consumption credit, agriculture, and in other fields; and if co-operative credit spreads easily among the poor, its educative influence will be great; and the Village Shylocks who are still lingering in various parts ought thus to be made to lose their trade.

The second problem is that of professional training. In the night schools, only general education in the three R's is now given. The labouring poor are usually engaged during the day in some handicraft for their livelihood; and, if in these schools some branch of professional training is also taught, it will be of immediate material service to the worker. The Western system of factory training or apprenticeship is ill-suited to the poorest classes of the population; and the foundations of industrial instruction have thus to be laid in these poor schools, so that the knowledge gained therein will develop and bear fruit in due course.

The third point is the medical inspection of boys. Apart from the habits of cleanliness that have to be learnt, the poor boys

have got to be examined at regular intervals by some medical officer; and this will go a great way in their developing a sense of healthy proportion in daily living and their avoiding all harmful intemperance and excess. We are of opinion that even in High Schools this sound experiment can be made with success. And it is all the more imperative among the poorer classes who can only slowly rise to a keen sense of the wholesome principles of decent living.

The Report looks forward with confidence to a time when an honest attempt can be made to feed and clothe some at least of the pupils, so that the burden of attending to their wants can be taken off the sholuders of their busy and care-ridden parents. This is an ambitious scheme, but if it can be carried out, nothing can bear out so elquently the fact that India has always been the land of charity. Annadana (the giving of food) has always been one of the highest Dharmas of every Indian householder; and we would earnestly call upon the various Annadana Samajams of the city to co-operate with the Poor School's Society in this direction.

Among other wholesome features that may be introduced in these schools may be mentioned the fitting up of a small vernacular library to which the pupils will have free access, lantern exhibitions, pleasure-trips to places hard by, short talks to the pupils on the elements of Indian civics, economics and religion, the scout system, etc. This general education will stand the poor in good stead ever afterwards, as it will enable them to cultivate the qualities of self-reverence, self-knowledge, and self-control which equip a man to fight successfully the battles of life.

To this end the report expresses the hope that every enthusiastic and public-spirited Indian may help forward this movement in charitable spirit. We have always believed that, apart from all sectional, caste, or class differences all Indians have a duty to their poorer brethren in this respect. Especially in the larger problems of child feeding and child-clothing, much pecuniary help is very necessary, and we are confident that it will be forthcoming.

In the annual meeting of the Poor School's Society that was held towards the end of last month, the Chairman, the Hon'ble Mr. S. Srinivasa Aiyangar, made a few concluding remarks on the work of the Society. The Advocate-General evidently thought that he could not be what he is if he did not advocate something, and therefore went out of his way to advocate that "caste must go." If the report is true, we cannot give credit to the Hon'ble Mr. Aiyangar's powers of advocacy outside the court. The caste system has not gone now, and yet the Report of the Society confidently dates that the workers are a band of enthusiastic people, and that they take cheerfully to the labour of love that they have taken upon themselves to do. Being a thoroughgoing social reformer, Mr. Aiyangar is perhaps not able to distinguish between social service and social reform. We have already in these columns shown how the Indian ideal of social service must for ever remain opposed to the Western ideal. But the kind of social service we have been considering can be advanced in public schools by people of all castes without any prejudice to the cause in which they are engaged. We, therefore, fail to see how the abolition of caste is a necessary preliminary to the successful accomplishment of the work which the Poor School's Society has in view.

Notes and Comments.

The Hon Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar, in his address as the President of the Provincial Social Conference at Conjeeveram, wants both Brahmins and Non-Brahmins to join together, "to educate the Hindu community to give up the caste system." Hinduism and caste have always held together. All attempts of so-called modern scholars and reformers to show that there is no caste in the Veda or Mahabharata have shamefully broken down. Witness the example of Mr. A Mahadeva Sastri, B. A., late of Mysore and now of the Adyar Library. Hinduism and caste are inseparably associated, and must live or die together. When the Hindu Community is "educated" give up its system of Varnasra-

ma, it will at the same time have been educated to give up also whatever is distinctively Hindu in it.

***

Every great spiritual ideal must have an appropriate physical organism to represent or preserve it, just as every soul must have a body. Now the greatest and the most essential truths of Hinduism are that "Brahman is one only without a second", that the realisation of Brahman is the exclusive privilege of birth as a Hindu, that the wheel of Karma brings on, in the ripeness of time, the blessing of re-incarnation in a suitable section and caste of Hindu society in this Punya-bhumi of Bharata Varsha, and thus the way is paved for liberation from the bondage of Samsara. Swami Vivekananda has said,—"India is the land to which all souls must come wending their way to God." India is the holy land, and Hindus are the holy people and society destined to secure, to all souls who incarnate in it and who observe the injunctions of Dharma, the supreme blessing and goal of liberation through self-realisation and god-realisation.

***

To destroy the immemorial constitution of Hindu society is to destroy the wonderful and unique social fabric in which "all souls" must be worn who are "wending their way to God." The great ideas above mentioned, and the sole means to the realisation thereof will then have also vanished from the earth. Our society will then no longer be synonymous with Hindu society, but will become like any other society in the West. All the great ideas and methods of realising Brahman will have altogether vanished. As nothing can be move absurd than that the soul can exist for us without a body, so nothing can be more absurd than to suppose that these great methods of self-realisation and god-realisation can remain to benefit mankind when the civilisation and society which forms the physical frame needed for their preservation and practice are destroyed.

***

The Hon. Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar says that "if, under the existing system, the average Brahmin or Non-Brahmin, is, or is claimed to be, on the whole, a just, sympathetic, and spiritually-minded Hindu, he is so in spite of the caste-system." We say the exact reverse,—i.e., under the existing system, if an average Brahmin or Non-Brahmin is spiritually-minded, it is entirely due to the caste-system which alone enables us to preserve the Vedic rites, and prayers and purify the mind and body and enable it to practise those marvellous methods of meditation which enable us to turn the mind inwards so as to realise the Atman beyond the phenomena forming the world of sense. This is what our Vedas and sages call spirituality,—not the political virtue of "Justice" or the social virtue of "sympathy" to which the Hon. Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar refers as if they are almost synonymous with or inseparably allied to, what he calls "spiritually-minded." Our modern educated men, so-called, are men entirely westernised and bent entirely on secular aims and acquisitions. They have no faith in, and they have taken no trouble about, the spirit of man, as the Hindu sages and scriptures have interpreted and explained it. We do not see why the Atman and department of knowledge relating to the Atman and its practical realisation should be ignored, because Europe and the Western world have, for obvious reasons, been unfavourably situtated for the cultivation of such knowledge and the methods of realising it in practice.

***

The Hon. Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar speaks of movements and protests against what he calls "the tyranny of caste." We have no sympathy with tyranny of any kind. Let him by all means put down tyranny. Let him get rid of caste tyranny wherever it exists, but let him restore caste to its true function in the Hindu social organism as expounded by all our great saints and interpreters of the Vedas in order that its world-old mission may be rightly fulfilled acording to the Vedic injunctions.

***

The Hon. Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar points out that from the time of Buddhism, there have been "protests" against the institution of caste in general, and against

the Brahmin caste in particular. That is, these protests have been persistently made for nearly 3000 years, and yet the institution has survived the changes and chances of this enormous length of time. There are now nearly 12 millions or more of Brahmins in all India. An institution or people or race having such unfading vitality must necessarily evoke the sympathy and support of a great scholar, statesman, or philanthropist, for there must be some valid reason for its preservation and some yet undiscovered source whence it derives its vitality. If so many revolts and attacks have not been able to compass its destruction, it ought to evoke the sympathy of all truly enlightened men, not their hatred or violence. Let the Hon. Mr. S. Srinivasa Iyengar try to penetrate to the heart of the matter, and he will surely see that there are more things in it than his social or political philosophy has learned or even dreamed of. There are even now, hundreds and thousands of men in India who have sat, like himself, at the feet of our Western educators and learned their "ideals of liberty, equality, and fraternity", and so are not out of the pale of what he calls "the educated Hindu mind." But they are by no means sharers in his view that our Hindu social ideals and institutions must be replaced by those of the West, or that they can no longer serve as means to those aims of self-realisation and god-realisation that our society has stood up for amid all the revolutions through which it has passed during the thirty centuries of which we have an authentic history. Will it not be more consistent with reason that he should try to preserve what has stood so long and effect all needed improvements in it so as to make it strong and efficient for the fulfilment of its mission, instead of seeking, to add his own giant's strength to that of others lesser than ne who, like the Christian Missionaries or the Samajists who profess a creed which is rightly described as "Christianity without Christ" are its determined and unrelenting enemies and are resolved to leave no stone unturned till the great and glorious fabric founded by the Rishis no longer finds a place to rest on where it has so long been active in its holy work of enabling souls to cross the shoreless ocean of Samsara.

*
* *

The Hon. Mr S. Srinivasa Iyengar refers with approval to Lord Morley's observation regarding what he calls "respect for the diginity and worth of the individual." It is Hinduism alone that has realised the true significance of "the individual." The individual is in truth, the soul which is imperishable, and not the transient configuration or conglommerate of mind and body on which the western world fixes its gaze and for whose welfare it works during the short span of time for which the human frame is visible on earth. The efforts of the so-called cread of Liberation in the West have only been directed towards the improvement of the lot of this transient human frame when it forms a member of some society or other on earth. Lord Morley derived his inspiration for liberation *avowedly* from the writings of the great atheistic apostle of modern rationalism, Voltaire. But the Hindu mind has soared, under the matchless guidance of our Rishis, beyond all perishable physical and material sheaths to the immortal essence of the human spirit and discovered in it the true import of "the dignity and worth of the individual." All Vedanta philosophy consists in the inquiry after the true import of the "diginity and worth" *of the individual* (or jiva) as the everlasting "one only without a second," and not as a thing made up of bone and brain and flesh and visible here on earth for but a brief term of years and then passing away like the baseless fabric of a vision. It is not nobler to work for an institution which is destined for the realisation of "the dignity and worth of the individual" in this lofty significance of the expression, than for the grovelling mechanism of clay whose enthusiasims after "liberty, equality and fraternity" are but "of the earth, earthy" and are bound to pass away with the brief period of its sojourn here and which have not helped to make the earth one whit nearer Paradise than it ever was for the reason that man's destined goal is not here, but he comes here only as a sojourner during his long and

wearisome journey towards that distant but enchanting, vision of his Supreme Self?

Olla Podrida.

In *New India* on 9th May 1918 there is a valuable description of the sixth annual celebration of the National Prayer Union. There was a gathering of ladies then. It seems that a very amusing ballad published by the union was sung on the occasion. Why do people want English names even in regard to religious congregations? Probably because they wish to sing amusing ballads. O frivolity, are you satisfied with your world-wide empire?

* * *

I hear that a gentleman on the staff of one of the leading dailies of Madras was refused an increment and was shown the door and the tongue of rumour says that this is because a high-placed relation of his is not pledged heart and soul to the new national education movement etc. The Legislative Council is full of questioners who expose bureaucratic lapses. In regard to lapses elsewhere it is all a case of master and servant and there is no tribunal over other employers, specially where the employer is one of the leaders of the public press. The press casts the search light of scrutiny over everything except itself.

* * *

During the labour May day demonstration in favour of peace, Mr. Ramsay Mac Donald's platform was stormed and wrecked by some men while a crowd carrying the Union Jack rushed the platform. Free speech, indeed! why, even in the home of free speech, free speech seems to be under a cloud. Mob oratory and mob rule are becoming the normal features of the so-called civilised life of to-day. Peace! who wants peace? We want only a procession of wars upon the highroad of civilisation, with a few brief periods of peace—like angel-visits few and far between—to prepare for war.

* * *

So the National College of Commerce has come. The most admirable features about it seem to be that the entire training is to be theoretical and to be imparted by men who have never known the practical sides of commerce. So far as we can see Japan set about her industrial regeneration in a different way altogether. The real and basic effort needed to-day is an educational and social and religious awakening side by side with the improvement of our industrial condition by giving industrial training *and* starting industries. But we do not care for what is humble and useful. We try to rush the citadel of national prosperity by storm (of speech). The mixing of colours in the national flag, the solution of various intricate mythical problems in the realm of communal representation, the nature and limitations of woman's franchise, and other national problems pressing for solution are being taken up and talked over and over again ignorance and poverty, the leading of lives devoid of love and grace, the increasing stress and conflict and materialism and joylessness of life, and other evils of the national soul are all unreal and unimportant problems which will solve themselves if the really important and urgent problems of our national life as described above are debated upon and given a verbal solution at conferences. Is it not so?

* * *

May I be permitted to say just a few words about our recent conferences? I beg leave with great diffidence to do so because politicians are apt to regard themselves as an exclusive heaven-born set and *The Hindu* has damned Mrs. Sarojini with faint praise and spoken grandiloquently about her not being well-vesred in "the arts of political warfare." It is something to know that our leaders and our led are experts at least in political war. The Provincial Conference discussed one resolution and one only in the main and performed wonderful somersaults in the course of its acrobatic performance. Even *The Hindu* calls the position as ludicrous and hence I hope that I may be forgiven. The humorous side of the entire proceedings is so obvious that it cannot be ignored. One leading daily calls Mrs. Sarojini the link between various communities. What is the meaning of a link and how are links made? Mrs. B. threatened to appeal to the country and get the decision of the conference reversed on appeal.

She declared that she could never be beaten in the end. The amendment that was moved was lost. But it seems to have been moved to such good purpose that it threatened to overthrow the original resolution by its momentum though the President's casting vote cast the last stone at it and killed it. Cæsar! thy shade is powerful still. Mrs. B. was so moved by the force of the lost amendment that she proposed to drop the original resolution. Then the leader of the opposition was so moved by this act of political magnanimity (or tact) that he and his party voted solidly for the original proposition and carried it *nem con.* What a transformation scene! The shuffling of the political cards now brought up one trump (leader) and now another. Each deal brought out new and unforeseen results. We now appreciate the the wisdom of the great men who said that the unexpected always happens.

***

Mrs. B. said that she was an old public speaker and did not care for the number's uttered by the audience and that the shout of the noisy should not settle the matter. What is the definition of a 'noisy man'? One who vociferates views opposed to yours? She then said that her enemies in the Congress were the elders and not the youngsters. Was this a mere rhetorical appeal to the soft hearted youngsters? Why should the elders be her enemies? I am afraid that calm judgment and a careful consultation of our immediate and distant interests have fled for ever from our deliberations. Theorising and shouting pretty catchwords have come to be the proud and permanent possessions of our national spirit. The worst of it all is that we hug all this as our best joy. Mrs. Sarojini said in her concluding address that division was the pledge of deeper union. So we shall all quarrel fiercely and go home and do nothing.

***

By the bye what become of the old industrial conference and exhibition which formed the tail of the Provincial Conference for sometime. Who docked the tail? I forgot that we had *resolved* to become rich and where there is a resolution there is a way (to further resolution?)

***

At the Social Conference also the salvation of India was defined, worked for, and attained. The Chairman of the Reception Committee pointed out that there wlll be success where there is Dharma. It is always delightful to hear the citation of scripture. The President said that the equilibrium of the Hindu society "must have been astonishingly unstable if it was capable of being so easily disturbed by the oratory of Anderson Hall." But the displacement of equilibrium in the world is due in a large measure to escaping gas. The orator not merely gasses but electrifies. The President welcomed the Varnashrama Dharma movements as helping the cause of social reform. Is it a case of encumbering with help or a case of imaginary help? He says that as sacrifice is the keynote of Brahminism the Brahmin should consummate the sacrifice by sacrificing his caste. This is a heroic remedy but we fail to see what it is intended to achieve or whether the gain will be more than the loss. He finally proves what he calls the indestructible soul of Hindiusm by praying for Super Buddism. To use his own words: "A faith may yet arise that shall do for us what Buddhism of its empire failed to achieve." Is this the end! Is this the end!.

SCRUTATOR.

The Myth of the Dravidian Race.

[BY K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI, B.A., B.L.]

I shall now say a few words about the prevalent false theories about the Ramayana and try to present the conclusions that can be legitimately drawn from that book. The Ramayana if it is studied aright will be found to disprove utterly the wild theories referred to already. It is clear that the Rakshasas were reciters of Vedas and had all the caste distinctions that prevailed among those who are admitted to be Aryans.

शुश्राव जपतां तत्र मन्त्रान्रक्षोगृहेषु वै ।
स्वाध्याय निरतांश्चैव यातुधानान्ददर्शसः ॥

[He (Hanuman) heard there in the houses

of Rakshasas the *mantras* recited by them and saw also Rakshasas devoted to the study of the Vedas]

[Sundarakanda].

षडङ्गवेद विदुषां क्रतुप्रवरयाजिनाम् ।

शुश्राव ब्रह्मघोषान्स विरात्रे ब्रह्मरक्षसाम् ॥

[He heard in the later portion of the night the recitations of Vedas by *Brahma Rakshasas* who were learned in the Vedas and six Vedangas and who used to perform sacrifices].

[Sundarakanda].

Hence it is absurd to say that the Rakshasas formed the most civilised communities of a supposed Dravidian race which had nothing to do with the Aryas and which had no caste distinctions. They were further cannibals and of low moral calibre though they were rich and strong. It is hence erroneous to say that they had attained a high measure of civilisation and refinement or that it was the contact with the Aryas that spoiled the south. I have already referred to the Tamil tradition that Agastya *saved* the Tamil country from Ravana. The Ramayana says about Agastya :

तस्येदमाश्रमपदं प्रभावाद्यस्य राक्षसैः ।

दिगियं दक्षिणा त्रासाद्दृश्यते नोपभुज्यते ॥

[This is the *Ashrama* of him owing to whose power this southern land is seen with fear by Rakshasas but is not overrun and enjoyed by them.]

In regard to the worship of Siva by Ravana and the argument founded on it to show that he was of a different race from the Aryas, I wish to point out that Rama himself worshipped Siva. Though there is no direct reference to the holy Rameswara Linga in the Ramayana, Rama on his return to Ayodhya in the Pushpaka Vimana says :

अत्र प्रसादमकरोन्महादेवः स्वयं मम ।

(Mahadeva Himself was gracious unto me here).

[Ramayana].

I have already shown the absurdity of the view about Siva being a Non-Aryan deity. Indeed none of the reasons given by the new school of Tamil scholars can bear a moment's scrutiny and are mere wild guesses inspired and generated by unworthy social hate. There are also other aspects of the Ramayana story to be discussed in this connection and I shall do so on a future occasion. I may however mention here that in the *Sundarakanda* there is a clear indication that Ravana spoke Sanskrit. Hanuman says in the following verse that if he spoke *Sanskrit* to Sita *like a Brahmin* she would take him to be Ravana and that he would therefore speak the ordinary dialect which was current in the land.

यदि वाचं प्रदास्यामि द्विजातिरिव संस्कृताम् ।

रावणं मन्यमानासा सीता भीता भविष्यति ॥

We are now fairly in a position to sum up our conclusions. It is not possible to discuss the subject at greater length within the limits of this article. All the Hindu communities of Southern India excepting perhaps those who are euphemistically termed Panchamas are entirely Aryan. The Panchamas are said by some scholars to represent surviving aboriginal tribes that must have lived in large numbers here ages ago. But there are other scholars who maintain with reasons worthy of serious consideration that the so-called Panchamas are also Aryans though there is a considerable degree of intermixture of blood in their case. The Aryans did not come into India from elsewhere but spread from their original home—the region between Saraswathi and Drishadwathi—in various directions. The earliest batches came south under the leadership of Agastya and were few in numbers. They adopted the languages prevailing in the south aud gave them permanence and elements of growth by preparing a grammar and settling literary standards. Then followed further batches from the north. After the advent of these the process of sanscritising was rapid. In the case of the Tamil tongue which had already reached a high state of perfection the process of sanscritising was slow and slight. But in the case of Malayalam, Kanarese, and Telugu it was rapid and complete. The theories that there was an independent Dravidian race whose representatives in modern times are the Tamil-speaking

Non-Brahmin communities, that Ravana was a great Dravidian Emperor, that there was a refined Dravidian civilisation subsequently spoiled by Aryan contact, and that there were no caste distinctions in the Dravidian race are mere figments of the imaginations of some people whose minds were and are fired by unworthy motives. The fact that Pandya and Chola Kings helped the Paudavas at the great Kurukshetra battle and the fact that Arjuna came south and married a southern Princess are important facts supporting the theory that is sought to be explained and proved in these pages. The fact that Siva is said to be the source of Sanscrit and Tamil alike is a tradition pointing in the same direction. It is thus abundantly clear that the newly started myths as to the origin and dispersion of a supposed Dravidian race deserve to be rejected by all serious thinkers in the West and in the East.

Public Life and Vedic Life.

[By M. K. Venkatesvara Iyer B.A., B.L.

So it will not be out of place to examine how our Vedas help us in the present national crisis. It is well recognised that the Puranas teach Vedic wisdom in a way which is very easy even for the less intelligent. The world-constitution is summarised in sloka 28 chap. 87 of the 10th skanda of Srimad Bhagavata where the deities presiding over the Vedas address the Supreme Being as follows:

"You are an emperor requiring no organs to govern. You inspire all other agencies in the world and empower them under your protection. Your subordinates called Devas offer tributes to you, they themselves collecting and enjoying the offerings of men. Your position may be compared to that of an Emperor to whom the feudatory sovereigns pay tributes. These devas are appointed to their respective posts by you and they discharge their duties always being responsible to you and afraid of you."

Now it will be seen from the above that the world-constitution is a universal empire composed of seen and unseen worlds and the several lokas are governed by Devas who owe allegiance to Iswara and are responsible to him for their good government. The Empires and kingdoms of the seen world are similar sub-divisions of the same and the various societies and families are further minor sub-divisions and the individual is the smallest sub-division, but all of a similar kind. It may be said that the individual, family, kingdom and the several lokas are minor plans of the universal Empire only differing in scales. As a matter of fact all these plans are supplied to us to have a clear conception of the entire creation according to the capacity of the observer just as plans are supplied to courts of law to have an idea of the disputed properties in litigations. It is not difficult to see that the British Empire is almost like this universal Empire having sub-divisions and minor divisions of similar character forming parts of one cohesive whole. Both are perfectly constitutional having as their motto,

"Wisdom, Liberty and Justice"
"Gnana, Moksha and Dharma."

Their object is to train the subjects in the art of self-government and to organise parts as the various organs of our bodies are to the entire body. The Hindus call this universal Empire Viratrupa and feel that our individual bodies are similar to it. India is one such part of the British Empire and as such its goal is recognised to be self-government under the British flag. In the universal Empire the various lokas are governed by Devas who always feel that they are responsible for the enhancement of peace, prosperity, happiness, wisdom and liberty of all living beings.

The Brahmanas in ancient days were enthusiastically co-operating with the Devas in carrying out the aims of the universal government. Their chief qualifications were

(1) To feel happy in working wisely and sincerely for the happiness of others

(2) To make a thorough study of all laws of the universal Empire called Dharma in Sanskrit

(3) To make all sacrifices necessary to carry out the aims of the Supreme Govern-

ment as expounded in the Vedas which are revolutions of impersonal unsullied infinite wisdom

(4) To organise and concentrate all the activities for achieving the above mentioned objects.

(5) To diffuse free education as widely and deeply as possible

The aims of the Congress men and members of the home rule league are also similar. So it will not be far wrong to say that they have imbibed in themselves the virtues of the Brahmanas of ancient days. But it is an absolute mistake to say that Brahmanas by birth alone are Congress men and home rulers. In ancient days Brahmanas learned everything during the period of Brahmachariship and arranged for all necessities of the household before they became a Dikshita at about the age of forty. As the function of a Dikshita is entirely to devote himself to work for the uplift of his fellow beings he may be compared to one who joins the Servant of India society. As there are stages of progress in this society there were seven gradations of Dikshitas according as they have performed one or more of the following sacrifices viz (1) Agnishtoma (2) Athyagnishtoma (3) Uktya (4) Shodasa (5) Vajapeya (6) Atirathra and (7) Aptoryama. In all these self-culture, purity of heart and sacrifice for the good of fellow beings constituted the essential elements. These Dikshitas had a clear and comprehensive grasp of all the Vedic teachings. They knew how to differentiate the various duties cast upon them. Their discrimination of primary, secondary and occasional duties was complete. They entrusted the responsibilities according to the qualifications of the persons amongst whom there was division of labour. The order of performances, the application of the lessons from one department to the others, the demarkation of common and special functions and the exceptions in certain cases were carefully attended to. Jaimini Sutras of Purva Mimamsa which was their guide for all these were carefully studied and respected by them. Every Dikshita has to perform (1) Agnihotra (2) Darsa purnamasa Ishti (3) Chaturmasya (4) Pasubandha (5) Santramani (6) Agrayana and (7) Pinda Pitri Yagna. These are sacrifices made daily, fortnightly, monthly, quarterly, half yearly, and annually for the welfare of the fellow beings. These correspond to our daily and fortnightly journals, weekly, fortnightly, monthly, lectures, and half yearly and annual conferences. In all these we sacrifice our personal comforts and domestic interests for the good of our countrymen and fellow beings. The Dikshitas try to satisfy the Devas or invisible helpers and invoke their blessings on living beings. The patriots try to convince the authorities to re-adjust matters in a way which will be more conducive to the well-fare and in both cases the fellow beings are taught by practical lessons in the line of further progress. It is not surprising if the authorities sometimes view business like activities in this direction with slight disapprobation as we find that even gods tried to place obstacles when the Brahmans were very regular and systematic in their religious observances as they were afraid that their position might be usurped by them. But it need hardly be said that not one in a million Brahmanas aspired to such positions and even that one aimed at them only when he is satisfied that he can serve his fellow beings better in that position. Then as regards the difference of opinion about the respect due to the really deserving, every patriot ought to sympathise with his fellow being if on accout of his ambition overriding his capacity and character he engenders feelings of jealousy towards those who are more advanced than himself. It may be developed into dislike even. Still the more advanced should not change their sympathetic attitude. This is a lesson which we study from the nature of the ancient day Deekshitas who never forget that Brahmanya is inseparable from Sarva Bhuta Hita Ratib infinite philanthrophy.

Printed and Published by T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A. at the Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.